

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated September 9, 2003. Claims 1-9 remain pending in this application. Claim 1 is the independent claim. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

On the merits, the Office Action rejected claims 1 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Shih et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,047,639; hereinafter "Shih"). The Office Action also rejected Claims 2-3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shih in view of Berkland (U.S. Patent No. 3,277,819; hereinafter "Berkland"). The Office Action also rejected Claims 5-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shih in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,678,848 to Roser et. al (Hereinafter "Roser"). The Office Action also rejected Claims 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shih in view of Whitesides et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,180,239; hereinafter "Whitesides"). Applicants respectfully submit that the claims 1-9 are patentable for at least the following reasons.

Applicants' Claim 1 recites: "[a] stamp for use in a lithographic process, said stamp comprising: a permeable stamp body with a first side and a second side, said first and second sides being opposed; a structured printing face at said first side; a

reservoir for a liquid at said second side; and a permeable carrier body with a higher rigidity constant than the permeable stamp body connecting said permeable stamp body and said reservoir, wherein said liquid is directly transported from said reservoir through said permeable carrier body and said permeable stamp body to said structured printing face during use."

Shih fails to recite or suggest a permeable carrier body with a higher rigidity constant than the permeable stamp body. Rather, Shih recites an ink spongy pad (70) and a stamping face (71) (see, e.g., Col. 3, lines 25-28). The Office Action argues that Shih's spongy pad 70 is a permeable carrier body. However, Shih's ink spongy pad (70) clearly fails to have a higher rigidity constant than stamping face (71). Ink spongy pad 70 is permeable exactly because it is less rigid than stamping face 71. Otherwise, depressing stamp face 71 would not promote ink to pass through ink spongy pad 70. Claim 1 is believed patentable over Shih for at least these reasons.

Claims 2-9 depend from independent Claim 1 discussed above and are believed patentable for at least the same reasons. However, each is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, and should be individually considered on its own merits. In addition, Applicants respectfully believe the above amendments

and remarks render the § 103 rejections of Claims 2-3 and 5-9 moot and request their withdrawal.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that allowance of the currently-pending claims is now justified, and favorable consideration is earnestly solicited. Applicants' agent can be contacted at the number below.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Aaron Waxler, Reg. No. 48,027

Agent

(914) 333-9630

December 9, 2003.